

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-7576

TEKOA T. GLOVER,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

E. RICHARD BAZZLE, Warden; HENRY MCMASTER,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Henry F. Floyd, District Judge. (CA-03-2689)

Submitted: November 18, 2004

Decided: December 1, 2004

Before LUTTIG and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Tekoa T. Glover, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Henry Dargan McMaster, Attorney General, John William McIntosh, Assistant Attorney General, Derrick K. McFarland, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Tekoa T. Glover, a South Carolina prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) without prejudice for failure to exhaust state court remedies. An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2254 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue for claims addressed by a district court absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Glover has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED